

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-13 are pending and claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 8-13 have been allowed. Claim 4 has been objected to and Claims 3 and 7 have been rejected under indefiniteness grounds. The specification has been objected to for various informalities.

In response, applicants amend claims 3, 4, and 7. Applicants also amend claim 5 for additional clarity. As requested by the Examiner, Applicants also have amended the specification to correct informalities and provide a substitution specification (except for the claims which are shown as amended to date). No new matter has been added.

Applicants thank the Examiner for allowing the claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 8-13.

Reconsideration and allowance of the remaining claims earnestly are requested.

#### ***Drawings:***

Applicants provide corrected drawings per draftsman's instruction on PTO-948 form.

#### ***Claim Objections:***

On page 4 of the office action, the Examiner has objected to claim 4 as allegedly improper form and noted that claim 4 does not further limit claim 1. In response applicants amend the claim by adding the description "the vector pBluescript KS(+) derivative comprises two SK primer sequence elements". Reconsideration is solicited.

#### ***Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 112:***


On page 4-8 of the office action, the Examiner has rejected claims 3 and 7 on alleged indefiniteness grounds. According to the Office Action, the terms "marker complex", "marker", "target structure" are not clearly defined in the specification. The Action inquires: a) which is the sequence that carries the 'marker'/'marker complex', the SKO or the plasmid; b) what is the 'marker

complex'- the SK primer sequence element itself, or the detectable element, because both are referred to as markers; and c) what comprises the marker complex, the SKO or the SK primer sequences of the plasmid. For clarity, applicants amend claims 3 and 7 to obviate this rejections.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objection to claim 4 and rejections against claims 3 and 7. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney to resolve any issues, in order to expedite the prosecution of the application.

8.11.03  
Date

Respectfully submitted,  
  
Colin G. Sandercock  
Reg. No. 31,298

HELLER EHRMAN WHITE & McAULIFFE  
1666 K Street, NW, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20006-1228  
(202) 912-2000 (telephone)